

# Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/124544/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Jones, Raya ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5419-677X> 2020. Dialogicality and culture of psychology in a study of individuation. Culture and Psychology 26 (4) , pp. 894-906. 10.1177/1354067X19871208 file

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X19871208>  
<<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X19871208>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies.

See

<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



## Dialogicality and Culture of Psychology in a Study of Individuation

Raya A. Jones, School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University

**ABSTRACT.** Viewing psychology as a cultural activity associated with technologies of the self, and noting the cultural phenomenon of the Jungian movement internationally, this paper presents a reading of Jung's 'A Study in the Process of Individuation' through the lens of dialogism. Jung's study pivots on the interpretation of paintings by a middle-aged American woman, 'Miss X', whom he treated in 1928. The present paper critically examines dialogical aspects of the Jungian text, such as Jung's metaphor of a dialogue with the unconscious, how he and his patient co-constructed her 'inner' dialogue, and the text's dialogue with its audience. It is concluded that the process of individuation described by Jung is fundamentally dialogical, evincing the human capacity to co-construct meanings of self-experience and thereby to change how we experience our own selves

The juxtaposition of the terms 'culture' and 'psychology' invites critical reflection on the cultural specificity of conceptualizing the mind in such a way that makes it possible, not only to formulate psychological inquiries about cultural activities, but also to devise and practise particular forms of what Foucault (1993) termed a 'technology of the self'; that is, a set of techniques that permit individuals to 'effect, by their own means, a certain number of operations' on their own bodies, souls, thoughts, and conduct, and doing it so as to 'transform themselves, modify themselves, and to attain a certain state of perfection, of happiness,' and so on (p.203). In C.G. Jung's analytical psychology, the state of perfection is the wholeness of the personality as achieved by integrating conscious and unconscious elements—a state and process that Jung termed *individuation*.

The worldwide appeal of the Jungian movement is a 'culture and psychology' phenomenon in its own right. Analytical psychology has long been highly influential in Japan, where its application is coupled with Kawai's (1988) distinction between the Japanese and Western psyche. Guo, Shen, Zhang and Wu's (2018) paper in *Culture & Psychology* attests to a Jungian influence in China. Guo et al. apply a concept of a 'cultural unconscious' that was developed in the late twentieth century by American followers of Jung. Analytical psychology continues to evolve. My focus, however, is on the historicity of Jung's own ideas.

Geertz (1973) contested a traditional view of humans as ‘culture-producing animals’ and endorsed an opposite view, according to which we are ‘incomplete or unfinished animals who complete or finish ourselves through culture—and not thorough culture in general but through highly particular forms of it: Dobuan or Javanese, Hopi and Italian, upper-class or middle-class, academic and commercial’ (p.49). I would add ‘Jungian’ as a highly particular form of culture. It is premised on the ‘culture-producing animals’ view and its ramifications as construed within the early twentieth-century psychoanalytical movement. ‘In a distinctly intimate way, psychoanalysis defends the private man against the demands made by both culture and instinct’ (Reiff 1959, p.329). Like Freud, Marx and others, Jung held that ‘disunity with oneself is the hallmark of civilized man’, that the ‘progressive subjugation of the animal in man’ resulted in a cultural ‘pathogenic conflict’, and therefore the route to wellbeing requires ‘the disunited man ... to harmonize nature and culture within himself’ (1966a, paras.16, 17). This harmonizing is the goal of individuation in a nutshell.

The view endorsed by Geertz is traceable to the eighteenth-century philosopher Herder, who spoke of ‘rising to humanity through culture’ (quoted in Gadamer 1975, p.9). Nineteenth-century German romanticism transformed Herder’s emphasis on the social genesis of the personality into an account based on the psychologizing of culture, which received its twentieth century ‘incarnation and most radical form’ in the theories of Freud and Jung (Danziger 1983, p.306). In the 1980s, postmodern psychology ‘rediscovered’ the idea of rising to humanity through culture. More recently, neuroscience has given a fresh boost to viewing ourselves as culture-producing animals. Damasio (2010) does not mention Jung, but his assertion that ‘all of our memories, inherited from evolution and available at birth or acquired through learning thereafter—exist in our brains in dispositional form, waiting to become explicit images or actions’ (p.144) sounds like a Jungian statement of the collective unconscious. Whereas Damasio seeks evidence in the brain, Jung believed that he found evidence for innate dispositions in the recurrence of motifs across diverse and unconnected sources such as patients’ dreams, fantasies, delusions, mythologies, religions, arts and more.

Jung (1968) interprets a series of paintings by a middle-aged American woman, ‘Miss X’, who came to Zurich in 1928. The pictures are included in the publication and, at the time of writing, can also be seen online (Purrington, 2019). Jung proposes that her painting activity performed a dialogue with the unconscious, the series evinces the initial stages of the individuation process, and her imagery parallels ancient and medieval symbolism, thereby attesting to a collective unconscious. His text performs a dialogue with the audience whereby he tries to persuade us of this truth. ‘The word lives, as it were, on the boundary between its

own context and another, alien, context,' averred Bakhtin (1981, p. 284). Jung's word about Miss X lives on the boundary between its own context and various contexts in which we agree or disagree with Jung. The following presents a reading of this Jungian text through the lens of dialogism with the aim of taking a closer look at this culture of psychology.

### **Jung's study in its own context**

'A study in the process of individuation' began as a 1933 conference paper which was subsequently published in 1934 in German. Later it was expanded in an English translation (Jung 1940), and then thoroughly revised in 1950 (Jung 1968). Elsewhere I compare the two versions with a focus on Jung's decades' long dialogue with his own ideas (Jones, in press). For the present purposes suffice it to give some signposts.

Early on Jung delved into Eastern thought. He painted his first mandala in 1916, then many more, and by 1920 came to realize that the image symbolizes 'the self, the wholeness of the personality, which is above all harmonious' (Jung 1989, p.196). The period in which he treated Miss X, autumn 1928, precipitated his exhaustive 'Commentary on "*The Secret of the Golden Flower*"' (published in 1929). The 1950 revision presents the study as 'a groping attempt to make the inner processes of the mandala more intelligible' (1968, para.623). By 1950 the term 'mandala' became a Jungian trope for the integrated personality, and little of his earlier engagement with Eastern thought is carried into the revision. The bulk of new material reflects his engagement with medieval alchemy and Gnosticism since 1928. 'As a matter of fact, it was this very case that led me to the study of alchemy,' claimed Jung (1940, p. 51) regarding the Miss-X case. His major works (*Alchemy and Psychology*, *Aion*, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, and most essays in *Alchemical Studies*) were published during 1944-1956. The 1950 revision of the case study belongs in this body of works.

Consequently 'alchemy' became a Jungian trope for the individuation process. As this process unfolds picture by picture in Jung (1968), Miss X disappears backstage. Her function is instrumental, like a fictional character created by an author to push the plot onward. The section 'Picture 1' centres on her situation. But in 'Picture 2', a brief account of her explanation of the painting quickly turns to a dense interrogation of esoteric symbolism, replete with quotations from the seventeenth-century Christian mystic Böhme. This spans about six pages before 'remembering' Miss X's picture. Picture by picture, her case is pushed aside as Jung delves into esoterica. For example, Picture 6 includes a plant motif because the night before painting it, she dreamed of a tree growing inside her room. Jung mentions in

passing an association with the maternal—a meaning that might be poignant to a childless woman in her fifties—but immediately turns to tree symbolism in Gnostic texts, the classics, and the Bible. He returns briefly to the picture only to recall another patient's dream of a laurel, and then discusses traditions concerning the laurel. Miss X neither painted nor dreamed of a laurel.

Jung labours at lengths the occurrence of specific elements (figurative, abstract shapes, colours, and numbers) in Miss X's pictures and in alchemy and Gnosticism. In Jungian practice, *amplification* is a heuristic technique that uses mythological, cultural and historical parallels of images that patients produce so as to make their personal problems more visible. Jung could not share the esoterica catalogued in 1950 with his patient in 1928 since he knew none of it at the time, as he stresses. The fact that a naïve woman painted symbols that only later he discovered in arcane sources convinces him that her pictures were 'genuine creations of the unconscious' (para.542). We may remain unconvinced. In the present context, the relevant 'datum' is Jung's dialogue with his own hypothesis.

### **Intrapersonal and interpersonal dialogicality**

Dialogue is a core metaphor in Jung's general description of the process that he sees unfolding also in Miss X's pictures. He wrote, originally in 1916, it is 'exactly as if a dialogue were taking place between two human beings with equal rights' (1969, para.186). The unconscious speaks of its own accord in dreams, projections, and so forth, but the achievement of individuation requires listening to its message. 'The ego takes the lead, but the unconscious must be allowed to have its say—*audiatur et altera pars*' [may the other side also be heard] (para.185). In the case of Miss X, the unconscious has its say also through her painting, and her conscious mind learns to listen (with Jung's guidance). He termed it the method of active imagination. Although Jung was using this method since about 1916, he published little about it. The Miss-X study is its most extensive demonstration, but even here it is mentioned only twice. Apropos the first picture that she brought to him, Jung comments that 'Since Miss X had discovered all by herself the method of active imagination,' he could broach her personal issues by discussing the picture (1968, para.528). In the Conclusion he suggests, almost as afterthought, that the study could redress his hitherto insufficient exposition of this therapeutic method (para.623). His reluctance to provide an explicit exposition could be linked to his objection to prescribing therapeutic formulas. Painting worked well for Miss X; other media might work better for other people, as Jung points out

throughout the text in focus. A dialogue with the unconscious is the crucial procedure from Jung's point of view.

Rowland (2005) highlights what she calls 'the dialogical aspect of the psyche' in Jungian theory (p.104). Comparing Bakhtin and Jung, Rowland notes that Bakhtin presents 'a far more materialistic conception of social interaction' (p.101). I tend to follow Bakhtin and, in this context, attend to the actual social interaction as well as the linguistic materiality of the Jungian text. Like any utterance, this text 'participates in the "unitary language" (in its centripetal forces and tendencies) and at the same time partakes of social and historical heteroglossia (the centrifugal, stratifying forces)' (Bakhtin 1981, p.272). The centripetal force in Jung's text keeps us fixated on the psychoanalytic understanding of 'private man' (Reiff 1959), who is 'characterized by inner diffusioness' and 'can organize or structure the inner, personal, and private dimension of his experience of the contemporary world only through psychology' (Homans 1995, p.5). The centrifugal forces of dispersion and difference challenge standard meanings of individuation as individualization or identity-forming.

Applying dialogism as an epistemology or even methodology—a way of reflexively analysing a text (Jones 2017)—facilitates a delineation of dialogical domains germane to the Jungian text. These domains are hierarchically nested, like concentric circles. If the dialogue with-the-unconscious is placed in the centre, this private domain is nested within an intersubjective domain that comes into being by virtue of her interactions with Jung, both face to face and in her study of his works.

For instance, Jung saw the emergence of inner differentiation in Miss X's Picture 5, which depicts a sphere enclosing four symmetrically placed spirals. In 1921 he had defined individuation as 'a process of differentiation' (1971, para. 757), referring to the differentiation of the functions of consciousness (thinking, feeling, sensation, intuition). She had read his works, and—as he points out—interpreted the four spirals as the four functions of consciousness on the basis of her knowledge of analytical psychology (1968, para. 565). He dismissed her interpretation, and offered another explanation for how the imagery represented differentiation—insisting that this meaning was 'not due to any conscious reflection' on her part (para. 564). Her conscious reflection was based on intellectual knowledge, hence was inauthentic and erroneous (in his judgement). Here and elsewhere we see Miss X positioning herself as the good student—an acolyte versed in his teachings and earnestly applying them—and see him positioning her as a misguided woman led astray by studying too much. If she is to retain her self-positioning as the acolyte, she must internalize his positioning of her. We see here a discursive production of selves (Davies and Harré

1990), and see also the inception of a narrative truth about her development: ‘something may become true simply by being put into words’ by the analyst (Spence 1982, p. 175). Since this inference of social construction inevitably rests on Jung’s account of their conversations, the text is underpinned by an epistemological bias that Jones (2007), also comparing Jung and Bakhtin, dubbed the ‘fugitive dialogical’: Jung denies dialogicality even when his own account demonstrates it.

Asserting, ‘the dialogic nature of human life itself’, Bakhtin (1984) averred that to ‘live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth’ (p.293). In Jung’s study we see Miss X asking questions, heeding Jung’s advice, and so forth. Marková (2003) defines *dialogicality* as the ‘fundamental capacity of the mind to conceive, create and communicate about social realities in terms of the Alter’ (p.85). Jung clearly functions as the ‘other’ who enables Miss X to acquire at a new perspective on herself. He insists that her pictures were spontaneous ‘irruptions’ of the unconscious—and yet his text reveals the co-creation of a reality wherein the pictures acquire the significance that Jung accords to them. At first blush, this challenges Jungian assumptions about the naturalness of the dialogue-with-the-unconscious, and by implication positions dialogism as antinomic to Jungianism. For present purposes suffices it to note that the Jungian text is characterized by tension between demonstrating an intrapsychic process that naturally happens if we let it happen, and unwittingly demonstrating the indispensability of discursive co-construction of that process. In turn, insofar as this tension is realized by a reader, it is nested within a dialogical domain that comes into being by virtue of the reader’s interaction with the text.

Fairclough (2003) defines the dialogicality of a text as ‘the dialogue between the voice of the author of a text and other voices’ in the text (p.41). The most dialogical text includes other people’s voices (e.g. attributing quotations to them), according to Fairclough. The Jungian text in focus includes Miss X’s reasoning about her pictures, even quotes her, but ultimately the text validates only Jung’s truth-claims. In Bakhtinian terms, this text is monologic, a form in which ‘there is only one subject—the mind that cognizes, contemplates, speaks and expounds—in opposition to whom ‘there is only a voiceless thing. Any object of knowledge (including man) can be perceived and cognized as a thing’ (Bakhtin 1986, p.161). The rhetorical mode of the Jungian text is argumentation. His presentation of clinical material serves to defend his general theory. Reading it as a piece of rhetoric, the story of Miss X functions as *narratio*—a term used in classical rhetoric to indicate a narrative designed to

manipulate the audience into agreement (the classic application is advocacy in the courtroom).

Gardner (2019) queries Jung's assumptions about emotionality apropos the Miss-X case in view of how ancient rhetoricians and Vico discussed the role of affect in *narratio*. My narrower reference to *narratio* centres on how Jung builds his argument. Nordquist (2017) quotes the Roman rhetorician Quintilian: 'in a piece of deliberative rhetoric, *narratio* is only supposed to include the facts that are germane to the presentation the speaker wants to make to his audience, "not saying more than the case demands"' (online). Jung does not say more about Miss X than his case for the existence of a collective unconscious demands. The pictures too are part of the *narratio*, for they furnish his argument with literally visible 'facts'. Consequently, the clinical material and the catalogue of esoterica form separate storylines that are overlain like waft and warp. Their interweaving is indispensable for the theoretical case that Jung is making, and his argument unravels if we pull out either of these threads. The following does this violence by teasing out a narrative about Miss X without engaging with Jung's interrogation of alchemy and mysticism.

### **The making of 'Miss X'**

Jung (1968) describes a woman with scientific education, whose acquaintance he made during the 1920s in the USA. After studying psychology for nine years, she travelled to Europe in 1928, aged 55, to continue her studies under him. Between the lines we may read what Erik Erikson described as the 'generativity versus stagnation crisis' in midlife. Erikson's theory was not yet articulated in 1928, but Miss X herself provided a metaphor of stagnation. She undertook the trip partly because she felt that she had 'got stuck,' and attributed her impasse to her distant relationship with her mother, who was already dead (para.525). Before coming to Zurich she visited Denmark, her mother's homeland, hoping that this would bring her closer to her mother and get her 'unstuck'. The Danish landscape affected her so deeply that she started painting, something she had never done before. The day before meeting Jung she tried to paint from memory. Whilst painting, she had a fantasy in which she saw her body stuck in the earth on a rocky beach. She felt trapped and helpless, and then saw Jung looking like a medieval sorcerer. She shouted for help, and he came along, touched the rock with a magic wand, and the stone burst open, releasing her (para.525). She painted this fantasy to the best of her limited artistic ability. The picture shows a crudely painted shore with rocks looking like grey eggs and pyramids. One rock morphs into a grey



woman looking out to the sea. In the sky there is a light-blue cloud with a yellow centre, supposedly Jung-the-sorcerer.

The allegory is transparent, and she fully recognized it. However, the picture indicated to Jung that what she really needed to know was not how ‘liberation might be possible’ in general (intellectual knowledge) but ‘how and in what way it could come about for her’ (para.528). Whereas the first picture was painted on impulse, the second was produced with intention and planning. Following Jung’s guidance, she let the composition become abstract. Circles replace the oval rocks. Jung-the-sorcerer becomes a zigzag flash of lightening that reaches down from the top, and half-encircles a sphere with a red nucleus at the centre of the picture (replacing the woman = herself). In Picture 3 the background is replaced with swashes of colour, the sphere acquires a belt of curved lines and the number ‘12’ inside it. The lightening is replaced with a small golden snake placed away from the sphere. In subsequent pictures, the sphere blossoms into a mandala.

Picture by picture, we glimpse an evolving dialogue between Miss X and Jung’s teachings (after all, she came to Zurich to continue her studies), and Jung’s reciprocation of her intellectual progress in his comments on her applications of his theory. Jung discloses that she knew his ‘stories of the dream life of African primitives’ (para.546), alluding to his idea of ‘big’ dreams (archetypal) which was inspired by the Elgoni. Picture 3 links to two ‘big’ dreams she had several years earlier. One dream centred on a snake in the sky—hence she painted a snake ‘as an afterthought’ (para.545). The floating sphere with an equatorial band bearing the number ‘12’ was taken from another dream. She understood the sphere as ‘symbolizing the “true personality”’; Jung endorsed this meaning, although he queried her understanding (para.549). Discussing details of the girdled sphere, she suggested that the black lines seen there are ‘lines of force’ meant to indicate motion; and Jung prompted for further elaboration, she described them as ‘Naturally, they are the wings of Mercury, the messenger of the gods. The silver is quicksilver!’ adding, ‘Mercury, that is Hermes, is the Nous, the mind or reason, and that is the animus, who is here outside instead of inside. He is like a veil that hides the true personality’ (para.545). Jung informs the reader that she was paraphrasing a paper of his (Jung 1966b) which she had read in a 1920 English translation (1968, para.545n.57). We see here her inculcation into Jungianism—she eagerly speaks the lingo—and the discursive production of her Jungian ‘self’.

Miss X comes across in Jung’s description as highly intelligent, motivated and independent. He praises her and simultaneously regards her as a victim of her intellect. In 1928 he already articulated the concepts of anima (the feminine principle) and animus (the

masculine) as archetypal elements, which constitute opposites of one's biological sex. The paper that Miss X paraphrased apropos Picture 3 warns about being possessed by the countersexual archetype: 'A woman possessed by the animus is always in danger of losing her femininity' (1966b, para.337). When she brought up the animus apropos this picture, Jung (1940) commented, 'Up to this time the patient lived in serious error suggested to her by the animus, ... He had made her believe that man is only an ego who has to do everything himself' (p.38). Her clinical problem transpires (in Jung's description) as an embodiment of a 'normal' modern malaise—a psychic imbalance manifesting in overvaluing rationality and autonomy. In the early version, likely to be read by her and others who could guess her identity, Jung (1940) stressed that she was 'in no way morbid or neurotic' (p.32).

Revising the study in 1950 (when she was already dead), Jung problematized her animus right away in the opening paragraph: 'She was unmarried, but lived with the unconscious equivalent of a human partner, namely the animus (the personification of everything masculine in a woman), in that characteristic liaison so often met in women with an academic education' (1968, para.525). He attributes her personality imbalance to 'a positive father complex': as 'the daughter of an exceptional father she had varied interests, was extremely cultured, and possessed a lively turn of mind,' but she was "fille à papa", and consequently did not have a good relationship with her mother' (para.525). While Jung assures us that 'her animus was not of the kind to give her cranky ideas. She was protected from this by her natural intelligence' (para.525), his caveat nonetheless reinforces a Jungian attitude that feminists find disconcerting: 'Female authority has been belittled as "animus possession"' (Young-Eisendrath 2012, p.43).

In Jung's view, Miss X was a disunited woman who ought to harmonize culture and her feminine nature within herself. Taking this 'diagnosis' on board, it bothered her that in Picture 3 the band of quicksilver (animus) was outside the sphere (whole personality) when it ought to be inside. She set out to correct it in the next picture. Instead, in Picture 4 the animus became a big black phallus-like snake that penetrates the sphere from above Jung. The sphere now looks like the female organ stylized to resemble a flower with silver petals. The sexual reference is plain to see. Jung tells us, 'she could not accept the snake, because its sexual significance was only too clear to her without any assistance from me' (1986a, para.559). She felt that this snake was 'a "terrible danger" ... threatening the "integrity of the sphere,"' so much so that 'fire breaks out (emotion)' at the point where the snake penetrates the sphere (para.559). Jung reassured her that it was perfectly normal, and showed her similar drawings by a male patient (para.559).

Did her emotional difficulty with it indicate a 'forbidden' attraction to Jung? We can merely conjecture. Jung deflected from the insinuation of any physical intimacy. On some level his deflection could feel like rejecting her womanhood, whilst simultaneously his steering opened up an understanding of the 'sexual' picture as a metaphor of her psyche fertilized by Jung's teaching. Later she told him, 'I suddenly understood the whole process in a more impersonal way' (para.559) and reflected that painting Picture 4 was 'the most difficult, as if it denoted a turning point of the whole process' (para.562). She felt that Picture 5 'followed naturally ... with no difficulty' (para.564). The sphere's nucleus now divides cell-like, which (as mentioned earlier) both she and Jung associated with inner differentiation. The black snake has detached from the sphere and now stands alone on the right. In my reading of the sequence, having tracked this element to Jung-the-sorcerer on the top left of Picture 1 where she faced him, 'he' is now behind her (see also Jones, in press).

In Picture 6 the snake disappears, and no equivalent element takes its place in the rest of the series. Nevertheless, when the sphere's background and nucleus become black in Picture 7, Jung interpreted it as 'the blackness of the snake' (para.574). He did not explicitly associate blackness with her depression, but commented that the picture's mood is 'painful suspension ... over the dark abyss of inner loneliness' (para.574). In my relational reading of the sequence, it is not surprising to read Jung's report that 'she now discovered that her "rapport" with me, her analyst (= father), was unnatural and unsatisfactory' (para.586). She wallowed in self-depreciation, admitting that she 'was very silly' (para.586). There is more blackness in Picture 8, but the plant-like shape within the mandala continues to grow. In Picture 9 five small green snakes appear inside the mandala, along with a goat, birds, and four hexagrams from the *I Ching*. Jung comments that 'the connection with the East is deliberately stressed by the patient' (para.597). Jung reads the meaning of her hexagrams in this order: 'a movement coming from the unconscious, and is expressed by music and dancing', 'self-restraint and reserve, i.e., a seeing decrease of oneself', 'growth and development of the personality, like a plant pushing out of the earth', and finally 'the personality becomes differentiated' (paras.598-601). It looks like a self-narrative of individuation meant to be read by Jung.

She left Zurich in January 1929 with Picture 10 unfinished, though finished it later. There are now two semi-human goats, birds, and crabs (representing her birth-sign, Cancer). Pictures 11-24 include more animate and environmental objects, now skilfully painted: the sun, moon, rainbow, human figures, cityscapes and sea. The later mandalas are aesthetically pleasing and give the impression of an artist experimenting with composition, colour, and

content. She painted Picture 24 in May 1938 on her last visit to Zurich. The centre of the mandala is a large white lotus-like flower with stylized leaves and two golden snakes below it. Pretty as it is, the picture lacks the dynamism and rawness of her initial paintings. Jung says nothing about it. To me, the making of ‘Miss X’ culminates in Picture 9, when the dialogue-with-the-unconscious that had been co-constructed with Jung settled into the reproduction of known symbolisms. Most likely these symbols genuinely meant something to the real person she was. But I ‘hear’ her own voice surfacing in precisely those elements that resist the Jungian romantic fixation on the arcane. As if picking up something she had let drop after her initial compulsion to paint the Danish landscape, the mandala in Picture 14 floats above Fifth Avenue New York over skyscrapers and cars of the era. In Picture 15 it floats between Manhattan and the sea; and in Picture 17, over a lake or lagoon. A note on the back of Picture 24 identifies the flower as ‘night blooming cereus’, the flower of an American cactus; she ‘is not copying a lotus from the mythologies of India or the medieval mystical white rose ... Instead, she defines her own American source of inspiration’ (Darlington 2015, p.388).

### **Closing reflections**

Jung (1968) disclosed that Miss X died of breast cancer sixteen years after her stay in Zurich. Back in the USA she painted many more mandalas, which she bequeathed to Jung. He selected a few to include in the revised study, but refrained from commenting on these because they came into his possession ‘unfortunately without text or commentary’ (para.616). The fact that he must have her input in order to interpret her paintings—and yet insists that the individuation process is universal (and therefore transcends the idiographic)—attests to the ‘fugitive dialogical’ in his works (Jones 2007). Moreover, he seems oblivious to the likelihood that Miss X was letting her unconscious have its say as long as it spoke Jungian language. Sceptics might opine that she duped him, but I am inclined to see a co-construction of meaning in a relationship defined by the power asymmetry of doctor-patient, teacher-pupil, and mentor-apprentice. She came to Zurich wanting him to liberate her, and found liberation through his technology of the self. Analytical psychology allowed her to find within herself something bigger than herself: a connection to our evolutionary past.

Miss X as the protagonist of Jung’s study should be kept separate from the real person. She was Dr Kristine Mann (1873–1945), daughter of a Swedenborgian minister. Accounts collated by Darlington (2015) tell of her outstanding achievements and contribution

to the Jungian movement in the USA (see also Anthony 2017). After receiving her medical degree in 1913, she devoted her life to women's health and education. She opened her own Jungian practice, one of the first in the USA, in 1921. In 1936, Mann and her lifelong friends, Ester Harding and Eleanor Bertine, created the Analytical Psychology Club of New York, which later became the Kristine Mann Library, now the world's most extensive collection in analytical psychology. Bair (2003) lists her among 'the many remarkable women who were profoundly influenced by Jungian psychology' and actively promoted it in Britain and the USA, and yet 'have always been relegated to secondary status, as little more than helpmates' to male champions of Jungian theory (p.305-6).

Jung's (1968) text, however, tells a story complete unto itself. Like traditional tales or indeed the 'archetypal' hero's journey, it begins with something amiss which mobilises the hero. Miss X feels 'stuck' and travels to Europe. There follows a sustained ordeal. She struggles through the analysis, confronts the villainy of her animus, and so on. There is a happy ending: she returns home to paint pretty mandalas. Negatively read, the text depicts an unfulfilled overeducated old spinster desperately seeking 'Jung'. Read with foreknowledge of her real identity may create a different impression, and we can appreciate Jung's efforts to anonymise the patient. Nevertheless, the text calls into question Jung's attitude to the women in his life (a topic that was outside the scope of this paper).

Finally, since the text begins with background information about a patient, we might expect a clinical-case narrative with a beginning (the background), a middle describing a course of treatment, and a happy ending (the patient is cured, ergo the treatment was effective). We would be disappointed. Palmer (2003) remarks, 'Jung tells us that this series of pictures "illustrates the initial stages of individuation," but unfortunately we do not know whether they provided Miss X with any therapeutic benefit' (p.145-6). Jung defends the omission: 'Our series of pictures illustrates the initial stages of individuation. It would be desirable to know what happens afterwards. But ... nobody has ever been able to tell the story the whole way ... for it is not the story-teller but death who speaks the final "*consummatum est*"' (1968, para.617). The story that Jung wants to tell is—not how Miss X was helped to overcome her midlife crisis—but 'how an entire lifetime expresses itself in symbolic form' (para.616). The text portrays him as a Socratic midwife who skilfully assists the natural birth of self-realization growing inside his patient. My contention is that he fathered this self-realization by providing a definite discourse and technology-of-the-self. This should not be taken as trivializing her development. My position is that the process of individuation was authentic *because* it was fundamentally dialogical. Our human capacity to

co-construct articulable meanings of our self-experience makes it possible for us to change how we experience our own selves.

## References

- Anthony, N. (2017). *Salome's Embrace: The Jungian Women*. London: Routledge
- Bair, D. (2003). *Jung: A biography*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Company
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin, TX: Texas University Press
- Bakhtin M.M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press
- Bakhtin M.M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press
- Damasio, A. (2010). *Self Comes to Mind*. London: William Heinemann.
- Danziger, K. (1983). Origins and basic principles of Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie*. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 22, 303-313
- Darlington, B. (2015) Kristine Mann: Jung's 'Miss X' and a pioneer in psychoanalysis. *Spring: A journal of Archetype and Culture* 92, 371-399
- Davies, B. and Harré, R. (1990) Positioning: the discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20, 43-64
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Foucault, M. (1993). About the Beginning of the Hermeneutics of the Self: Two Lectures at Dartmouth. *Political Theory* 21, 198-227
- Gadamer, H-G. (2004). *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum
- Gardner, L. (2019). Affectivity in narratio and individuation. In Jones R.A. & Gardner L. (Eds.) *Narratives of Individuation*. (pp. 149-162). London: Routledge
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books
- Guo, R., Shen, H., Zhang, Y., & Wu, B. (2018). Representations and symbols of Kuafu's myth in Analytical Psychology and Chinese culture: History vs. contemporary, consciousness vs. unconscious, collective vs. individual. *Culture & Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X18804122>
- Homans, P. (1995) *Jung in Context*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press
- Jones, R.A. (2007). *Jung, Psychology, Postmodernity*. London: Routledge
- Jones R.A. (2017). Towards dialogic epistemology: The problem of the text. *Qualitative Research*, 17, 457–472

- Jones, R.A. (in press). The Snake in the Mandala: Dialogical aspects of Jung's 'A Study in the Process of Individuation'. *Journal of Analytical Psychology*
- Jung, C.G. (1966b). The relations between the ego and the unconscious (*Collected Works*, Vol.7). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work: 1928).
- Jung, C.G. (1940). A study in the process of individuation. *The Integration of Personality* (pp. 30-51). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co
- Jung, C.G. (1966a). On the psychology of the unconscious. (*Collected Works*, Vol.7). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work: 1943).
- Jung, C.G. (1968) A case study in the process of individuation. (*Collected Works*, Vol.9i). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work: 1950).
- Jung, C.G. (1969). The transcendent function. (*Collected Works*, Vol.8). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work: 1916/1957).
- Jung, C.G. (1971). Psychological Types. (*Collected Works*, Vol.6). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Original work: 1921)
- Jung, C.G. (1989). *Memories, Dreams, Reflections*. New York: Vintage (Original work: 1961)
- Kawai, H. (1988). *The Japanese Psyche*. Dallas, TX: Spring
- Marková, I. (2003). *Dialogicality and Social Representations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nordquist, R. (2017). Narratio in Rhetoric. Available: <https://www.thoughtco.com/narratorhetoric-term-1691416> (accessed 9 September 2018)
- Palmer, M. (2003). *Freud and Jung on Religion*. London: Routledge
- Purrrington Mr. (2019). Paintings by Kristine Mann in 'A Study in the Process of Individuation.' Available: <https://carljungdepthpsychologysite.blog/2019/05/11/paintings-by-kristine-mann-in-mc.manuscriptcentral.com/CAPdr-jungs-cw-9i-a-study-in-the-process-of-individuation/#.XQYjHbxKjIV> (accessed 15 July 2019)
- Rieff, P. (1959) *Freud*. London: Victor Gollancz
- Rowland, S. (2005) *Jung as Writer*. London: Routledge
- Spence, D.P. (1982) *Narrative Truth and Historical Truth*. London: Norton
- Young-Eisendrath, P. (2012). *Subject to Change*. Hove and New York: Routledge